SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TENNESSEE'S ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK State Board of Education Meeting June 23, 2004

Original Policy	Proposed Revision	Justification	Negotiated Amendment
The graduation rate includes only those students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma by four years and a summer.	Students with disabilities or English language learners may still be counted in the graduation rate if they graduate with a regular diploma by five years and a summer.	Students that face unique challenges, such as being identified with a disability or being limited English proficient, may still be able to reach the State's challenging standards for graduation but need more time to do so. This change will reflect that reality and allow schools and districts to receive credit for assisting these to meet the State's graduation standards even though it takes them more time to meet the State's standards.	Proposed revision approved.
Tennessee uses one, two, or three years' worth of data to determine whether a school, district, or the State has met adequate yearly progress (AYP). The "safe harbor" provision will be employed when appropriate. The State did not specify how the process of using this multi-tier approach would be implemented.	Tennessee will apply specific steps in using one, two, or three years' worth of data to determine whether a school, a district, or the State has made adequate yearly progress. After the school or district has not had success at meeting adequate yearly progress (AYP) using one, two, or three years' worth of data, the State will employ Safe Harbor provisions as the final step to determine the school's or district's AYP status.	The U.S. Department of Education required clarification about the process the Department would use to look at multi-year data in determining a school's or district's status. The Department has designed a flexible process that looks at each subgroup's status and applies the method which would produce the most success in determining whether the school or district made AYP.	Proposed revision approved.
Tennessee develops an Alternate Standards Assessment for students with disabilities by Spring 2004.	Tennessee will use out-of-level testing for students with disabilities as an alternative assessment for school year 2003-2004. Starting with school year 2004-2005, the State will use a new Alternate Standards Assessment especially developed for students with disabilities. This assessment will provide another alternative assessment in	When the final regulations related to the inclusion of students with disabilities in the assessment and accountability system were released by the U.S. Department of Education, they allowed states to use out-of-level assessments as alternative assessments for	Orally approved.

	addition to the newfolio accessored for students and	students with dischilities I	Ι
Tennessee allows only	addition to the portfolio assessment for students with disabilities. Tennessee will define what most severely cognitively.	students with disabilities under certain circumstances. The State thought that with additional time to design a new Alternate Standards Assessment for students with disabilities, the assessment would be improved with additional time for development and implementation. Because of this, the State requested an amendment that would grant more time to develop this new alternate assessment. The U.S. Department of Education issued new	Proposed revision approved
1% of the district's tested population to take the alternative assessment for students with disabilities. Only severely cognitively disabled students, defined as students who are three standard deviations below the mean, are allowed to take the alternative assessment.	Tennessee will define what most severely cognitively disabled means. Only those students meeting the criteria will be eligible to participate in the alternative assessment. Tennessee will permit districts to exceed the 1% cap on the number of proficient and advanced scores based on the alternate achievement standards that can be included in AYP calculations if the LEA establishes that the incidence of students with the most significant disabilities, as defined by the State, exceeds the limit and if the LEA documents circumstances that explain the higher percentage. Without approval of the waiver requesting the extension of the 1% cap, proficient scores exceeding this cap must be changed to below proficient for accountability purposes. The State may apply to the U.S. Department of Education for a state waiver on the 1% cap.	regulations which allow states to take advantage of more flexibility in the testing of students with disabilities.	Proposed revision approved.
Tennessee determines whether schools and districts have met the math and reading/language arts annual measurable objective annually. The State applies the 95% confidence interval only to small schools having total tested populations of less than the minimum N.	Tennessee will determine whether schools and districts have met the math and reading/language arts annual measurable objectives by applying a 95% confidence interval to all schools starting with data from the 2003-2004 school year.	Tennessee analyzed the impact of the current requirements after 47% of the State's schools and 92% of districts did not meet AYP for school year 2002-2003. The State believes that schools and districts were over-identified and is proposing to use a 95% confidence interval to ensure more statistically valid determinations. When impact analysis was done, it was determined that identification of schools and districts as failing AYP based on 2002-2003 data would decrease substantially. Only 21.8% of elementary/middle schools would have been identified as failing instead of 46.5%. High schools failing AYP would decrease from 56% to 31.1%. Districts failing elementary/middle level would decrease from 88.3% to 77.4%	Proposed revision approved

		while at the high school level the reduction would be 68.3% to 40.7%.	
Tennessee uses the results of the criterion-referenced test administered in grades 3-8 to determine the AYP status for elementary and middle schools, their districts, and the State starting with the Spring 2004 testing.	Tennessee will administer the criterion-referenced test in grades 3-8, but it will only include the results of grades 3, 5, and 8 for AYP determination for elementary and middle schools, their districts, and the State until school year 2005-2006 when they will use grades 3-8 to determine the AYP status of schools, districts, and the State.	No Child Left Behind does not require states to test in grades 3-8 until school year 2005-2006. Until 2005-2006, states may test only one grade in elementary, in middle, and in high school. Although Tennessee will begin testing in grades 3-8 sooner than required, the State will use only the results from grades 3, 5, and 8 in reading/language arts and math to determine AYP status until 2005-2006.	Proposed revision approved.
Tennessee includes only Gateway math scores for determination of AYP for high school first time test takers.	Tennessee will reserve the Gateway math scores of middle school students who take the test early. Their scores will be included into their receiving schools' and districts' AYP calculations.	Test scores from middle school students who take the Gateway Math test are not currently included in any school's AYP determination. By "banking" these students' middle school scores, they will be included in their high schools' math AYP determinations in the year they enter their high school. Other states have had this process of "banking" scores approved.	Proposed revision approved
Tennessee identifies high schools as failing AYP if their graduation rate is below 60%.	Tennessee will identify high schools as failing AYP if their graduation rate is below 90% or shows no improvement from the previous year. Tennessee will apply a 95% confidence interval to this indicator.	Tennessee wants to set high standards for its schools but give credit to schools that show progress. The State's value-added system is based on this premise. This proposal would help the State to be more statistically confident that its determination is accurate by employing a 95% confidence interval.	Tennessee will identify high schools as failing AYP if their graduation rate is below 90% or shows no improvement from the previous year. The application of a 95% confidence interval to graduation rate has been denied.
Tennessee identifies elementary and middle schools as failing AYP if their attendance rate is below 93%.	Tennessee will identify elementary and middle schools as failing AYP if their attendance rate is below 93% or shows no improvement from the previous year. Tennessee will apply a 95% confidence interval to this indicator.	Tennessee wants to set high standards for its schools but give credit to schools that show progress. The State's value-added system is based on this premise. This proposal would help the State to be more statistically confident that its determination is accurate by employing a 95% confidence interval.	Tennessee will identify elementary and middle schools as failing AYP if their attendance rate is below 93% or shows no improvement from the previous year. The application of a 95% confidence interval to

			attendance rate has been denied.
Tennessee uses an N count of 45 for schools and districts regardless of their size.	Tennessee proposed an N count of 200 for district AYP calculations.	92% of Tennessee districts did not make AYP based on their 2002-2003 data. The State thinks this is an overidentification of districts.	The minimum N count is 1% of the tested students or 45 whichever is greater.
Tennessee identified districts as not meeting AYP if the district does not make AYP based on its elementary/middle school results or its high school results. Two consecutive years of failing AYP at either or both levels would classify an LEA in improvement.	Tennessee would identify those districts in LEA Improvement only if both their elementary/middle and high school level results do not meet AYP for two consecutive years. For those districts that contain only one grade span level, the district AYP status would be determined on the status of that level and two consecutive years of failing AYP would identify the district as in LEA Improvement.	Tennessee identified 92% of its districts as not making AYP based on 2002-2003 school year. With the application of this proposed revision, districts identified as not making AYP would decrease from 92% of districts identified to 65% identified. As Tennessee is committed to ensuring that the State only identifies those districts that need technical assistance and extra resources, this decrease in the percent of districts potentially identified in LEA Improvement would be beneficial.	Proposed revision approved.
LEP students must take the State assessments in reading/language arts and math regardless of how long they have been in an American school. Their results are included in the school, district, and state AYP determinations.	LEP students would take only the math assessment and the English language proficiency test the first academic year they are in an American school. Their participation in these two assessments would be included in the participation rate but not in the AYP determination. Students who are identified as LEP and monitored for two years after they test proficient will not be counted in the LEP subgroup to meet the minimum N, but their scores will be counted in that subgroup when the minimum N count is achieved by a school or district.	The U.S. Department of Education issued new guidance in February 2004 which allows states this flexibility for LEP students during their first year in an American school. This will allow these students to be assessed in ways that are more likely to yield results that are more reflective of their achievement. In addition, schools and districts will not be held accountable in their AYP determinations for these students.	Proposed revision approved.
Tennessee identifies schools and districts as not making AYP when they do not make the 95% participation rate requirement. All students enrolled in the school must be assessed for inclusion in the participation rate calculation.	Tennessee will use data from the previous one or two years to average the participation rate data for a school and/or subgroup, as needed. If the current year or the two- or three-year average meets or exceeds 95%, the school will still meet the AYP requirement. When calculating participation rate for the school, the State will allow schools to omit students who cannot take the assessment during the entire testing window due to a significant medical emergency.	The U.S. Department of Education announced new flexibility for calculating participation rate on March 29, 2004. This new flexibility will allow more schools and districts to demonstrate that they have met the participation rate requirements in <i>No Child Left Behind</i> .	Proposed revision approved.
Tennessee rounds off proficiency percentages	Tennessee would round off proficiency percentages to whole numbers to determine AYP status.	This process will match the annual measurable objectives that have been rounded off to whole	Proposed revision approved.

to the thousandths to determine AYP status.		numbers.	
Tennessee uses annual	Tennessee would use the annual measurable objectives	The State Board of Education has requested the	Proposed revision approved.
measurable objectives	listed in the tables below. These objectives have been	Department to round off these calculations. This	
that are reported in the	rounded to the nearest whole number.	change will be easier for educators and the	
thousandths.		public to understand.	

Tennessee's Targets for Reading/Language Arts and Math at the Elementary/Middle School Level Determined by the Percent of Students at the Proficient or Above Levels

School Year	Reading/Language Arts Target	Math Target	Attendance Rate
2002-2003 through			
2003-2004	77%	72%	93%
2004-2005 through			
2006-2007	83%	79%	93%
2007-2008 through			
2009-2010	89%	86%	93%
2010-2011 through			
2012-2013	94%	93%	93%
2013-2014	100%	100%	93%

Tennessee's Targets for Reading/Language Arts and Math at the High School Level Determined by the Percent of Students at the Proficient or Above Levels

School Year	Reading/Language Arts Target	Math Target	Graduation Rate
2002-2003 through			
2003-2004	86.0%	65%	90%
2004-2005 through			
2006-2007	90%	74%	90%
2007-2008 through			
2009-2010	93%	83%	90%
2010-2011 through			
2012-2013	97%	91%	90%
2013-2014	100%	100%	100%

Proposed Amendments that Were Denied

Original Policy	Proposed Revision	Justification	Status
Tennessee applies the AYP annual measurable objectives to all schools and districts based on 2002-2003 data. 47% of schools and 92% of districts failed AYP.	Tennessee will apply the 95% confidence interval to all schools and districts retroactively and redetermine their AYP status.	If the 95% confidence interval is approved, then it seems consistent to apply that same model to 2002-2003 data and re-evaluate schools' and districts' AYP status. From the impact analysis, this would result in a significant reduction in the number of schools and districts as not meeting AYP.	Denied May 2004
Tennessee applies an N of 45 for all subgroups to determine AYP for all schools.	Tennessee will apply an N of 45 for all subgroups except for students with disabilities and limited English proficient. For these two subgroups, the N would be 55.	Tennessee is in development of alternative assessments for both students with disabilities and limited English proficient students. However, at this point, most students in these two subgroups take the regular assessment with accommodations. The State does not believe that these two subgroups are reliably assessed with this method. The State proposes to increase the N count for these two subgroups to increase the reliability of the assessment results of these two groups when used for accountability purposes. An impact study shows that the identification of elementary and middle schools would be reduced from 21.8% to 20.9% when an N of 55 for these two subgroups and the 95% confidence interval is applied. At the high school level, a reduction from 31.1% to 30.2% would occur.	Denied May 2004
Tennessee applies an N of 45 for all subgroups to determine AYP for all districts.	Tennessee would increase its N count to 200 for all subgroups at the district level.	Tennessee identified 92% of its districts as not making AYP based on 2002-2003 school year. With a confidence interval of 95% applied and an N of 200, only 32.9% of districts would be identified based on their elementary and middle school results and only 36.6% on their high school results.	Denied June 2004
Tennessee does not include value-added in its AYP determination.	Tennessee will use value-added for schools and districts in addition to the "Safe Harbor" provision as an indicator for meeting AYP for special education and limited English proficient subgroups at the school or district levels.	Tennessee has value-added data for schools and districts which allows the State to determine the academic growth that individual students have made from year to year. This data is aggregated to the school, district, and state levels. Schools and districts will be able to use this wealth of data to demonstrate that even though the special education and limited English proficient subgroups have not been able to demonstrate meeting the annual measurable objectives or Safe Harbor provisions, individual students in those subgroups have demonstrated tremendous growth through the effective programs that were implemented to serve them.	Denied May 2004
For AYP determinations, Tennessee includes only those students identified as disabled under IDEA categories under the students with disabilities subgroup.	For AYP determinations, Tennessee includes those students identified as disabled under IDEA categories as well as gifted students under the students with disabilities subgroup.	Under Tennessee education law, gifted students are identified under the special education category. To be consistent with state law, Tennessee's proposal would expand the subgroup of students with disabilities to include gifted students. This inclusion would potentially allow a school or district to count more students with disabilities as proficient or above.	Denied May 2004